

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:

Karamchedu et al.

Application No.: 10/635,184

Filed: August 6, 2003

For: Method and Apparatus for Semantic
Qualification and Contextualization
of Electronic Messages

Examiner: David Eng

Art Unit: 2155

Confirmation No.: 9182

Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents
Commissioner for Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

APPELLANT'S APPEAL BRIEF RESUBMITTED IN RESPONSE TO
NOTIFICATION OF NON-COMPLIANT APPEAL BRIEF

TO THE HONORABLE COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS:

This is Appellant's Brief resubmitted in response to the Notification of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief and in support of the Notice of Appeal to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences, appealing the decision of the Examiner in the Final Office Action mailed April 22, 2008 ("Final Office Action"), in which the claims of the above-captioned application were again rejected. Appellant respectfully requests consideration of this Appeal by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences for allowance of the present patent application.

I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest in the above-identified application is Kryptiq Corporation, of Beaverton, OR.

II. RELATED APPEALS

The Appellant's undersigned attorney and the assignee identified above are not aware of other appeals or interferences that would directly affect or be directly affected by, or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the subject Appeal.

III. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 1 and 3-48 are pending and are being appealed. Claim 2 was previously cancelled.

Claims 1 and 3-48 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and are presently appealed.

Claims 1 and 3-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

Claims 1 and 3-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 7,028,075 to Morris (Morris) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,199,081 to Meyerzon et al. (Meyerzon).

IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

No amendments have been filed subsequent to the Final Office Action.

V. SUMMARY OF THE CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

Independent claim 1 is directed toward a computer implemented method comprising determining by a computing device a context to be applied to an electronic mail message; identifying by a computing device one or more elements within the electronic mail message based at least in part upon the context; and associating by a computing device one or more semantic qualifiers with the one or more elements to provide contextualization of at least a portion of the electronic mail message.

The subject matter of claim 1 may be found in the specification at page 7, lines 5-9, and lines 17-22; page 8, lines 2-6; page 9, line 1 to page 10, line 2; page 16, line 21 to page 17, line 14; page 19, lines 3-21; and Figure 8, as well as elsewhere throughout the specification.

For example, determining by a computing device a context to be applied to an electronic mail message may be found at page 7, lines 5-9 and page 16, line 21 to page 17, line 14. Identifying by a computing device one or more elements within the electronic mail message based at least in part upon the context may be found at page 19, lines 3-21. Associating by a computing device one or more semantic qualifiers with the one or more elements to provide contextualization of at least a portion of the electronic mail message may be found at page 7, lines 17-22 and page 9, line 1 to page 10, line 2.

Independent claim 13 is directed toward a method comprising receiving by a computing device an indication from a user identifying one or more text elements within an electronic mail message; determining by a computing device whether or not the identified one or more text elements corresponds to an identified context; and automatically associating by a computing device one or more semantic qualifiers with the one or more identified text elements to provide contextualization of at least one of the electronic mail message and the one or more text elements upon determining that the identified one or more text elements correspond to the identified context.

The subject matter of claim 13 may be found in the specification at page 7, lines 5-9, and lines 17-22; page 8, lines 2-6; page 9, line 1 to page 10, line 2; page 17, line 16 to page 18, line 5; and Figure 7, as well as elsewhere throughout the specification.

For example, receiving by a computing device an indication from a user identifying one or more text elements within an electronic mail message may be found at page 17, lines 19-21. Determining by a computing device whether or not the identified one or more text elements corresponds to an identified context may be found at page 17, line 21 to page 18, line 3. Automatically associating by a computing device one or more semantic qualifiers with the one or more identified text elements to provide contextualization of at least one of the electronic mail message and the one or more text elements upon determining that the identified one or more text elements correspond to the identified context may be found at page 8, lines 2-6 and page 18, lines 3-5.

Independent claim 20 is directed toward a method comprising receiving by a computing device input from a user identifying a portion of an electronic mail message corresponding to an identified context; and automatically associating by a computing device one or more semantic qualifiers with the identified portion of the electronic mail message to facilitate contextualization of the identified portion.

The subject matter of claim 20 may be found in the specification at page 7, lines 5-9, and lines 17-22; page 8, lines 2-6; page 9, line 1 to page 10, line 2; page 17, line 16 to page 18, line 5; and Figure 7, as well as elsewhere throughout the specification.

For example, receiving by a computing device input from a user identifying a portion of an electronic mail message corresponding to an identified context may be found at page 17, lines 19-21. Automatically associating by a computing device one or more semantic qualifiers with the identified portion of the electronic mail message to facilitate contextualization of the identified portion may be found at page 8, lines 2-6 and page 18, lines 3-5.

Independent claim 25 is directed toward a computing device comprising a storage medium having stored therein a plurality of programming instructions designed to perform the method of determining a context to be applied to an electronic mail message, identifying one or more elements within the electronic mail message based at least in part upon the context, associating one or more semantic qualifiers with the one or more elements to provide contextualization of at least a portion of the electronic mail message; and at least one processor communicatively coupled to the storage medium to execute the programming instructions.

The subject matter of claim 25 may be found in the specification at page 7, lines 5-9, and lines 17-22; page 8, lines 2-6; page 9, line 1 to page 10, line 2; page 16, line 21 to page 17, line 14; page 19, lines 3-21; page 20, line 12 to page 22, line 12; and Figures 8, 10, and 11, as well as elsewhere throughout the specification.

For example, a storage medium having stored therein a plurality of programming instructions may be found at page 22, lines 1-7. Determining a context to be applied to an electronic mail message may be found at page 7, lines 5-9 and page 16, line 21 to page 17, line 14. Identifying one or more elements within the electronic mail message based at least in part upon the context may be found at page 19, lines 3-21. Associating

one or more semantic qualifiers with the one or more elements to provide contextualization of at least a portion of the electronic mail message may be found at page 7, lines 17-22 and page 9, line 1 to page 10, line 2. Description of a processor may be found at page 20, lines 17-18, and in Figure 10.

Independent claim 37 is directed toward a computing device comprising a storage medium having stored therein a plurality of programming instructions designed to perform the method of receiving an indication from a user identifying one or more text elements within an electronic mail message, determining whether or not the identified one or more text elements corresponds to an identified context, automatically associating one or more semantic qualifiers with the one or more identified text elements to provide contextualization of at least one of the electronic mail message and the one or more text elements upon determining that the identified one or more text elements correspond to the identified context; and at least one processor communicatively coupled to the storage medium to execute the programming instructions.

The subject matter of claim 37 may be found in the specification at page 7, lines 5-9, and lines 17-22; page 8, lines 2-6; page 9, line 1 to page 10, line 2; page 17, line 16 to page 18, line 5; page 20, line 12 to page 22, line 12; and Figures 7, 10, and 11, as well as elsewhere throughout the specification.

For example, a storage medium having stored therein a plurality of programming instructions may be found at page 22, lines 1-7. Receiving an indication from a user identifying one or more text elements within an electronic mail message may be found at page 17, lines 19-21. Determining whether or not the identified one or more text elements corresponds to an identified context may be found at page 17, line 21 to page 18, line 3. Automatically associating one or more semantic qualifiers with the one or more identified text elements to provide contextualization of at least one of the electronic mail message and the one or more text elements upon determining that the identified one or more text elements correspond to the identified context may be found at page 8, lines 2-6 and page 18, lines 3-5. Description of a processor may be found at page 20, lines 17-18, and in Figure 10.

Independent claim 44 is directed toward a computing device comprising a storage medium having stored therein a plurality of programming instructions designed to perform

the method of receiving first user input identifying a portion of an electronic mail message, receiving second user input assigning one or more semantic qualifiers to the identified portion, and automatically associating the one or more semantic qualifiers with the identified portion of the electronic mail message to facilitate contextualization of the identified portion; and at least one processor communicatively coupled to the storage medium to execute the programming instructions.

The subject matter of claim 44 may be found in the specification at page 7, lines 5-9, and lines 17-22; page 8, lines 2-6; page 9, line 1 to page 10, line 2; page 10, line 7 to page 11, line 20; page 17, line 16 to page 18, line 5; page 20, line 12 to page 22, line 12; and Figures 2, 7, 10, and 11, as well as elsewhere throughout the specification.

For example, a storage medium having stored therein a plurality of programming instructions may be found at page 22, lines 1-7. Receiving first user input identifying a portion of an electronic mail message may be found at page 10, lines 7-14; page 11, lines 12-14; and page 17, lines 19-21. Receiving second user input assigning one or more semantic qualifiers to the identified portion may be found at page 10, lines 15-22 and page 11, lines 14-16. Automatically associating the one or more semantic qualifiers with the identified portion of the electronic mail message to facilitate contextualization of the identified portion may be found at page 11, lines 1-8 and lines 16-20. Description of a processor may be found at page 20, lines 17-18, and in Figure 10.

VI. GROUND OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

Whether claims 1 and 3-48 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

Whether claims 1 and 3-48 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 7,028,075 to Morris (Morris) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,199,081 to Meyerzon et al. (Meyerzon).

VII. ARGUMENT

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claims 7-9, 18-19, 21, 31-33, 42-43, and 45

In the Final Office Action, identification of the support for the subject matter of claims 7-9, 18-19, 21, 31-33, 42-43, and 45 is requested.

Claims 7-9 and 31-33 are directed to, for example, aggregating at least a subset of the one or more elements based upon one or more semantic associations. The Specification indicates that rules or policies may be established, for example to aggregate/group content, which may, in an embodiment, be searchable. Support for the aggregation operations recited in the claims may be found in the Specification at page 7, line 22 to page 8, line 2 and page 12, line 17 to page 13, line 3, as well as in the claims as originally filed.

Claims 18-19, 21, 42-43, and 45 are directed to, for example, identifying a set of attributes associated with the one or more text elements and displaying the attributes to a user, as well as other functions of the attributes. Support for the use of attributes may be found in the Specification, for example, at page 15, line 18 to page 16, line 2; page 17, line 11 to page 19, line 2; and Figure 6b, as well as in the claims as originally filed.

For the above reasons, Appellants submit that the claims are sufficiently supported and definite and thus request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 1 and 3-48 – Computer Implemented Method(s)

The Final Office Action states that the Specification discloses methods steps as being performed by a human being, but asserts that the claims are directed to steps performed automatically by a computer. Detailed support for each portion of the claims is provided above in Section V. SUMMARY OF THE CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER.

Addressing the generation/selection of semantic qualifiers, for example, at page 10, line 4, the section labeled “Manual Qualifier Generation” begins. That section provides user identification of portions of an electronic message to be semantically highlighted. By contrast, at page 16, line 15, the section labeled “Automatic and Semi-Automatic Qualifier Generation” begins. That section provides, in part, for a context to be

automatically determined by e.g. semantic qualification logic 108 (see page 17, lines 4-9) and for the computing system to make a determination as to whether the identified element(s) correspond to an identified context. The identified sections are merely exemplary and are intended to illustrate the type of language in the Specification that provides for both manual and automatic methods (methods performed by a user and those performed by a computer). The claims are sufficiently clear to identify which elements/steps are being claimed, and such features are fully supported in the Specification.

The Final Office Action states that Appellants have admitted that “their method steps recited in the claims are user input/interaction performed by a user. . . .” The relevant statement made by Appellants is rather “[t]he fact that a method may be assisted in some way by user input/interaction does not mean that the method is not computer implemented.” Such a statement does not admit that the steps of the methods are performed by a user. Instead, the statement was intended to clarify that the steps of the method are directed to computer implemented processes. For example, in claim 13, the first element of the claim recites “receiving by a computing device an indication from a user identifying one or more text elements” That statement is directed to the receipt by the computer of the identification and is thus directed to the computer implemented part of the method. Appellants’ point above was intended to make clear that simply because a user may identify the text elements, the claim is directed to the computer implemented part of the method and is within the scope of patentable subject matter.

For the above reasons, Appellants submit that the claims are sufficiently definite and thus request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 4, 13-24, 28, 37-48 – Use of the term “automatically”

The Final Office Action also objects to use of the term “automatically,” which appears in independent claims 13, 20, and 37, as well as various dependent claims. For example, independent claim 13 provides for the automatic association of one or more semantic qualifiers with the one or more identified text elements to provide contextualization of at least one of the electronic mail message and the one or more text elements upon determining that the identified one or more text elements correspond to

the identified context. Support for these features may be found in the Specification at page 8, lines 2-6; page 16, line 15 to page 18, line 10, and Figure 7, as well as elsewhere throughout the Specification. The above-mentioned portions of the Specification indicate that, in embodiments, the association of the qualifiers with the text elements may be manual or automatic. The automatic association may be enabled through a variety of embodiments, for example, the use of one or more lookup or symbol tables to determine whether the identified element(s) are known to exist in the applicable context, and if so, the association of the elements with one or more qualifiers to contextualize the message. The Specification makes it clear that the term “automatic” is directed specifically to an operation that does not require additional user input (see for example page 8, line 3 and page 16, lines 19-20). Further, the term “automatic” has a clear and understood meaning in the art as supported by the description in the Specification.

For the above reasons, Appellants submit that the claims are sufficiently definite and thus request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

As is well established, the Examiner bears the initial burden of factually supporting any *prima facie* conclusion of obviousness. See MPEP 2142. To establish a *prima facie* conclusion of obviousness the factual basis must show (1) a sufficient reason to combine the teachings of the references; (2) a reasonable expectation of success; and (3) the combined teachings must teach or suggest all of the claim elements. The Supreme Court in *Graham v. John Deere Co.* set out the inquiries necessary to develop this factual basis. 383 U.S. 1, 17-18 (1966); see also MPEP 2141. These inquiries include determining the scope and content of the prior art; ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue; and resolving the level of ordinary skill in the art.

The Examiner has failed to provide a sufficient factual basis to support a *prima facie* case of obviousness of claims 1 and 3-48 over the cited references.

In particular, ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue requires interpreting the claim language, and considering both the invention and the prior art references as a whole. See MPEP 2141.02. This has not been done, as further detailed below.

Morris and Meyerzon

Claims 1 and 3-48 are rejected over Morris in view of Meyerzon.

Claim 1 provides a computer implemented method comprising determining by a computing device a context to be applied to an electronic mail message; identifying by a computing device one or more elements within the electronic mail message based at least in part upon the context; and associating by a computing device one or more semantic qualifiers with the one or more elements to provide contextualization of at least a portion of the electronic mail message.

The Final Office Action cites Morris for teaching that one may create an HTML email message. The Final Office Action further cites Meyerzon for teaching that HTML documents may contain metadata and metatags. However, Morris and Meyerzon, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest at least one feature of claim 1, and thus claim 1 is patentable over the cited references.

The cited portion of Morris is Column 5, lines 34-38, which recites “[i]n an alternate embodiment, the photomail server 20 creates an HTML email message 31 to send and imbeds links 33 to scaled-down versions of the sent images 21. The recipient may thus view the resulting photo album in his/her normal email program 38.” As indicated by the citation above, Morris is directed to a system for sharing digital images over the Internet and thus has nothing to do with semantic qualification of messages. This citation merely indicates that email messages may be transmitted in an HTML format.

The cited portion of Meyerzon is Column 1, lines 35-44, which recites “[a] HTML document contains text and tags. HTML documents may also contain metadata and metatags. Metadata is data about data and metatags define the meta-data. Examples of metatags that identify meta-data are ‘author,’ ‘language,’ and ‘character set.’ HTML documents may also include tags that contain embedded ‘links’ or ‘hyperlinks’ that reference other data or documents located on the same or another Web server computer. The HTML documents and the document referenced in the hyperlinks may include text, graphics, audio, or video in various formats.” This citation merely indicates that HTML documents may include metadata and metatags.

Thus, if combined, Morris and Meyerzon would provide an HTML email

document/message containing metadata/metatags. However, such a description falls short of teaching or suggesting all the features of claim 1.

Claim 1 provides in the first recited operation that a context is determined for the message. At no point in either Morris or Meyerzon is there a teaching or suggestion of providing a context for a message or document. As used in the present Specification, a context describes the framework for the message, such as “related to an episode of care” or “medical-related” which helps categorize the message and distinguish the message from another context (for example, one dealing with a billing issue, personnel, etc.). The Office Action is silent on this point. As described in the present Specification (and recited in claim 1 as discussed below), the determination of the context (for example, related to an episode of care) in turn identifies or facilitates in the identification of the elements to which a semantic qualifier may be associated. As recited in claim 1, the particular elements within the message (for example, words in the message) may be identified based on this context (the categorization of the type of message). Thus, as an example, if a message is related to an episode of care, the particular identified elements may include the patient’s name, chief complaint, etc. A different context may result in the identification of different text elements. Further, it is those items that are “based at least in part upon the context” and thus may be associated with the one or more semantic qualifiers.

With regard to determining a context for a message, the Final Office Action initially addresses Appellants’ argument by stating that the argument is not understood. The Final Office Action further states, with respect to the provision of a context for a message or document, that no such limitation appears in any of the claims. However, for example, claim 1 recites determining “a context to be applied to an electronic mail message . . .” and claim 13 recites “to provide contextualization of at least one of the electronic mail message and the one or more text elements” The remaining claims contain similar features. The Final Office Action overlooks the clear claim language and provides no counter-argument to address this lack of teaching in the cited references.

Morris and Meyerzon in fact do not provide for the determination of a context to be applied to a message. Therefore, Morris and Meyerzon also do not provide for the identification of one or more elements within the message based at least in part upon the

context. These features in concert with the association of semantic qualifiers allow for the contextualization desired.

The arguments presented in the Final Office Action (page 4) merely address the manner in which metatags may be used to define metadata. But, the metatags and metadata in Meyerzon are not identified based on the message context, and further a determination of a context for the message is nowhere taught or suggested in Meyerzon (or in Morris).

Thus, based on the different functions and the different results derived therefrom, Morris and Meyerzon clearly fail to teach or suggest all the features of claim 1, and claim 1 is therefore patentable over Morris and Meyerzon.

Independent claims 13, 20, 25, 37, and 44 contain language similar to that of claim 1 and thus are patentable over Morris and Meyerzon for at least the same reasons as discussed above for claim 1.

Claims 3-12, 14-19, 21-24, 26-36, 38-43, and 45-48 depend from claims 1, 13, 20, 25, 37, or 44, directly or indirectly, and are thus patentable over Morris and Meyerzon for at least the reasons discussed above.

VIII. CONCLUSION

Appellant respectfully submits that all the appealed claims in this application are patentable and requests that the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences overrule the Examiner and direct allowance of the rejected claims.

We do not believe any fees are needed as payment was previously submitted with the Appeal Brief. However, should that be necessary, please charge Deposit Account No. 500393. In addition, please credit any overages to the same account.

SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.

Dated: July 30, 2008

/Steven J. Prewitt/

Steven J. Prewitt, Reg. No. 45,023

Pacwest Center, Suite 1900
1211 SW Fifth Avenue
Portland, OR 97204
Telephone: 503-222-9981

CLAIMS APPENDIX

1. (Previously Presented) A computer implemented method comprising:
determining by a computing device a context to be applied to an electronic mail message;
identifying by a computing device one or more elements within the electronic mail message based at least in part upon the context; and
associating by a computing device one or more semantic qualifiers with the one or more elements to provide contextualization of at least a portion of the electronic mail message.
2. (Cancelled).
3. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 1, wherein said identifying by a computing device one or more elements within the electronic mail message comprises receiving by a computing device an indication from a user identifying the one or more elements.
4. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 1, wherein said identifying by a computing device one or more elements within the electronic mail message comprises automatically identifying by a computing device the one or more elements based at least in part upon the context.
5. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 4, wherein said determining by a computing device a context comprises determining by a computing device the context based upon one or more standardized data models.
6. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 4, wherein said determining by a computing device a context comprises determining the context based upon an XML Schema.

7. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 1, further comprising aggregating by a computing device at least a subset of the one or more elements based upon one or more semantic associations.

8. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 7, wherein said aggregating by a computing device at least a subset of the one or more elements comprises aggregating by a computing device at least a subset of the one or more elements to form one or more secondary electronic documents.

9. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 7, wherein said aggregating by a computing device at least a subset of the one or more elements comprises aggregating by a computing device at least a subset of the one or more elements upon transmission of the electronic mail message.

10. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 1, wherein said identifying by a computing device one or more elements comprises identifying one or more words.

11. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 1, wherein said associating by a computing device one or more semantic qualifiers with the one or more elements comprises associating by a computing device one or more metadata tags with the one or more elements.

12. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 11, wherein said associating by a computing device one or more metadata tags with the one or more elements comprises associating by a computing device one or more metadata tags formatted in accordance with one or more markup language syntaxes with the one or more elements.

13. (Previously Presented) A method comprising:
receiving by a computing device an indication from a user identifying one or more text elements within an electronic mail message;

determining by a computing device whether or not the identified one or more text elements corresponds to an identified context; and

automatically associating by a computing device one or more semantic qualifiers with the one or more identified text elements to provide contextualization of at least one of the electronic mail message and the one or more text elements upon determining that the identified one or more text elements correspond to the identified context.

14. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 13, wherein said receiving by a computing device an indication from a user identifying one or more text elements within an electronic mail message comprises receiving by a computing device an indication from a user identifying one or more words within the electronic mail message.

15. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 13, wherein said automatically associating by a computing device the one or more semantic qualifiers with the one or more identified text elements comprises automatically associating one or more metadata tags with the one or more identified text elements.

16. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 15, wherein said automatically associating by a computing device one or more metadata tags with the one or more identified text elements comprises embedding the one or more metadata tags within the electronic mail message.

17. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 13, wherein said determining by a computing device whether or not the identified one or more text elements corresponds to an identified context comprises determining by a computing device whether or not the identified one or more text elements corresponds to an identified context based upon one or more standardized data models.

18. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 13, further comprising:
identifying by a computing device a set of attributes associated with the identified one or more text elements; and

displaying by a computing device the set of attributes to the user.

19. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 18, further comprising:
receiving by a computing device a second indication from the user identifying an attribute from the set of attributes displayed to the user; and
automatically associating by a computing device a second one or more semantic qualifiers with the identified one or more text elements to facilitate contextualizing of at least a subset of the one or more elements within the electronic mail message.

20. (Previously Presented) A method comprising:
receiving by a computing device input from a user identifying a portion of an electronic mail message corresponding to an identified context; and
automatically associating by a computing device one or more semantic qualifiers with the identified portion of the electronic mail message to facilitate contextualization of the identified portion.

21. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 20, wherein the one or more semantic qualifiers are associated with one or more selectable attributes, the method further comprising:
determining by a computing device whether or not the one or more semantic qualifiers are present within the identified context; and
displaying by a computing device to the user the one or more selectable attributes corresponding to the one or more semantic qualifiers to facilitate further contextualization of the identified portion, upon determining that the one or more semantic qualifiers are present within the context.

22. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 20, wherein the electronic mail message comprises a header section and a body section, and wherein said receiving by a computing device input from a user identifying a portion of an electronic mail message comprises receiving by a computing device input from the user identifying a selected one or more words from the body section of the electronic mail message.

23. (Original) The method of claim 22, wherein the one or more semantic qualifiers are included within the body section of the electronic mail message.

24. (Original) The method of claim 22, wherein the one or more semantic qualifiers are included within the header section of the electronic mail message.

25. (Original) A computing device comprising:
a storage medium having stored therein a plurality of programming instructions designed to perform the method of
determining a context to be applied to an electronic mail message,
identifying one or more elements within the electronic mail message based at least in part upon the context,
associating one or more semantic qualifiers with the one or more elements to provide contextualization of at least a portion of the electronic mail message; and
at least one processor communicatively coupled to the storage medium to execute the programming instructions.

26. (Previously Presented) The computing device of claim 25, wherein the plurality of programming instructions are further designed to associate one or more metadata tags with the one or more elements.

27. (Previously Presented) The computing device of claim 25, wherein the plurality of programming instructions are further designed to receive an indication from a user identifying the one or more elements.

28. (Previously Presented) The computing device of claim 25, wherein the plurality of programming instructions are further designed to automatically identify the one or more elements based at least in part upon the context.

29. (Previously Presented) The computing device of claim 28, wherein the plurality of programming instructions are further designed to determine the context based upon one or more standardized data models.

30. (Previously Presented) The computing device of claim 28, wherein the plurality of programming instructions are further designed to determine the context based upon an XML Schema.

31. (Original) The computing device of claim 25, wherein the plurality of programming instructions are further designed to aggregate at least a subset of the one or more elements based upon one or more semantic associations.

32. (Previously Presented) The computing device of claim 31, wherein the plurality of programming instructions are further designed to aggregate the at least a subset of the one or more elements to form one or more secondary electronic documents.

33. (Previously Presented) The computing device of claim 31, wherein the plurality of programming instructions are further designed to aggregate the at least a subset of the one or more elements upon transmission of the electronic mail message.

34. (Previously Presented) The computing device of claim 25, wherein the plurality of programming instructions are further designed to identify one or more words within the electronic mail message based at least in part upon the context.

35. (Previously Presented) The computing device of claim 25, wherein the plurality of programming instructions are further designed to associate one or more metadata tags with the one or more elements.

36. (Previously Presented) The computing device of claim 35, wherein the plurality of programming instructions are further designed to associate the one or more

metadata tags formatted in accordance with one or more markup language syntaxes with the one or more elements.

37. (Original) A computing device comprising:
a storage medium having stored therein a plurality of programming instructions designed to perform the method of
receiving an indication from a user identifying one or more text elements within an electronic mail message,
determining whether or not the identified one or more text elements corresponds to an identified context,
automatically associating one or more semantic qualifiers with the one or more identified text elements to provide contextualization of at least one of the electronic mail message and the one or more text elements upon determining that the identified one or more text elements correspond to the identified context; and
at least one processor communicatively coupled to the storage medium to execute the programming instructions.

38. (Previously Presented) The computing device of claim 37, wherein the plurality of programming instructions are further designed to receive an indication from a user identifying one or more words within the electronic mail message.

39. (Previously Presented) The computing device of claim 37, wherein the plurality of programming instructions are further designed to automatically associate one or more metadata tags with the one or more identified text elements.

40. (Previously Presented) The computing device of claim 39, wherein the plurality of programming instructions are further designed to embed the one or more metadata tags within the electronic mail message.

41. (Previously Presented) The computing device of claim 37, wherein the plurality of programming instructions are further designed to determine the context based upon one or more standardized data models.

42. (Original) The computing device of claim 37, wherein the plurality of programming instructions are further designed to
identify a set of attributes associated with the identified one or more text elements;
and
display the set of attributes to the user.

43. (Original) The computing device of claim 42, wherein the plurality of programming instructions are further designed to
receive a second indication from the user identifying an attribute from the set of attributes displayed to the user; and
automatically associate a second one or more semantic qualifiers with the identified one or more text elements to facilitate contextualizing of at least a subset of the one or more elements within the electronic mail message.

44. (Original) A computing device comprising:
a storage medium having stored therein a plurality of programming instructions designed to perform the method of
receiving first user input identifying a portion of an electronic mail message,
receiving second user input assigning one or more semantic qualifiers to the identified portion, and
automatically associating the one or more semantic qualifiers with the identified portion of the electronic mail message to facilitate contextualization of the identified portion; and
at least one processor communicatively coupled to the storage medium to execute the programming instructions.

45. (Original) The computing device of claim 44, wherein the plurality of programming instructions are further designed to
determine whether or not the one or more semantic qualifiers are present within a context; and
display to the user, one or more selectable attributes corresponding to the one or more semantic qualifiers to facilitate further contextualization of the identified portion, upon determining that the one or more semantic qualifiers are present within the context.

46. (Previously Presented) The computing device of claim 44, wherein the electronic mail message comprises a header section and a body section, and wherein the plurality of programming instructions are further designed to receive a first user input identifying a selected one or more words from the body section of the electronic mail message.

47. (Original) The computing device of claim 46, wherein the one or more semantic qualifiers are included within the body section of the electronic mail message.

48. (Original) The computing device of claim 46, wherein the one or more semantic qualifiers are included within the header section of the electronic mail message.

EVIDENCE APPENDIX

None.

RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

None.